

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/018,350	03/20/2002	Wolfgang Bremser	IN-5544	4876
26922	7590 04/01/2004		EXAMINER	
BASF CORPORATION ANNE GERRY SABOURIN			TARAZANO, DONALD LAWRENCE	
26701 TELEGRAPH ROAD			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SOUTHFIEL	D, MI 48034-2442		1773	1 *

DATE MAILED: 04/01/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	•				
	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/018,350 BREMSER, WOLFGANG				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	D. Lawrence Tarazano	1773			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period was preply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	66(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely, the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	t,		
Status	*	·.			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	_•				
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This	action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	53 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims					
4) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or					
Application Papers					
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the c	•	· ·			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 11.	,	, -			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of 	have been received. have been received in Application ity documents have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on Noed in this National Stage	3		
Attachment(s)					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary				
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/07/01, 09/28/03. 	Paper No(s)/Mail Da				

Application/Control Number: 10/018,350

Art Unit: 1773

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because the abstract is too long. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Double Patenting

2. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

3. Claims 1, 3-7, 18, 23, and 24 provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-3 of copending Application No. 09/868,095. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because it appears that both applications are directed to the same composition. While applicants have added functional language in the preamble of the instant application it appears that these claims are directed to a "cured" or "curable" composition and the second application is directed to said composition and cured articles made there of.

Art Unit: 1773

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

4. Claims 1-24 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double

patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-19 of U.S. Patent No. 6,506,836. Although the

conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because

claim 1-4 are directed to a process making the polymers used in the instant application wherein

the dispersion of the polymers claim 15, 18 and 19 are the polymers used in the claimed

"compositions". Even if the instant claims were limited to a coated article, it is the examiner's

position that it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have used these

dispersions to make coated articles.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claims 1 and 3-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being

indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which

applicant regards as the invention.

The preambles in claim 1 and the related claims are confusing. It is not clear if the

applicants claim a coated article or merely claim a composition. It is unclear what is meant by a

"system" in the claims and what they intend the scope of the claims to be.

Art Unit: 1773

If the applicants intend this to be a coated article the examiner suggests that the applicants claim "A substrate comprising a coating" and then have dependent claims related to the features of the preamble (e.g. "A coated article according to claim 1, wherein in the substrate is primed").

7. Regarding the PCT search Report: The international Opinion States:

D1: US-A-5 840 372.

Document D1, which is regarded as the closest prior art, discloses (see column 1, lines 7-30, column 2, lines 8 and 22-41; and Examples A and B) a method for producing a multilayer protective and/or decorative coating on a substrate, a pigmented aqueous basecoat containing a polyacrylate resin being applied to a substrate. The polyacrylate resin can be obtained by radically polymerizing a mixture comprising monomer (a) (furfuryl acrylate and/or furfuryl methacrylate and, for example, hydroxyalkyl esters of acrylic or methacrylic acid) and monomer (b) (for example acrylonitrile, methacrylonitrile, styrene, vinyltoluene-). A polymer film of the basecoat is first applied to the substrate, a clear coat then applied and finally both coating layers are baked together. The coating is used, in particular, to coat motor vehicles.

8. The examiner notes that claim 1 must have more than one ring group located on the monomer (b). This is not the case for the art cited in the PCT search report. It is the examiner's position that the prior art does not apply to the claimed invention.

Application/Control Number: 10/018,350

Art Unit: 1773

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to D. Lawrence Tarazano whose telephone number is (571)-272-1515. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 to 6:00 (off every other Friday).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Paul J Thibodeau can be reached on (571)-272-1516. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

D. Lawrence Tarazano Primary Examiner Art Unit 1773

dlt